IMPRIMATUR.

Decemb. 29. 1685.

C. Alſton R. P. D. Hen. Epiſc. Lond. à Sacris Domeſticis.

IMPRIMATUR.

Decemb. 29. 1685.

C. Alſton R. P. D. Hen. Epiſc. Lond. à Sacris Domeſticis.

A

PAPIST

Not Misrepresented by

PROTESTANTS.

BEING

A REPLY

TO THE

REFLECTIONS

Upon the Answer to [*A Papist Misrepresented and Represented.*]

Dr William Sherlock

LONDON:
Printed for *Ric. Chiswel*, at the Rose and Crown in St. *Paul's* Church-Yard. MDCLXXXVI.

A

PAPIST

Not Misrepresented by

PROTESTANTS

BEING

A REPLY

TO THE

REFLECTIONS

Upon the Answer to [*A Papist Misrepresented and Represented.*]

LONDON:
Printed for *Tyc. Gilwell*, at the Rose and Crown
in St. Paul's Church-Yard. MDCLXXXVI.

A REPLY *to the* REFLECTIONS *upon the* ANSWER *to the Papiſt Miſrepreſented*, &c.

I Do not love to be behind-hand in Civility with any Man, and therefore, in the Name of the Anſwerer, I return the Reflecter his Complement, and that with ſome advantage: For I heartily thank him for the Civility of his Language, and more for the Civility of his Arguments; and having done this once for all, I ſhall apply my ſelf to conſider his Reflections, and will complement no more.

His Reflections conſiſt principally of two general Heads.

I. What concerns the Miſrepreſentation of a Papiſt.

II. Concerning the Rule of true repreſenting.

I. The Miſrepreſentation of a Papiſt. And here I confeſs, he has ſhewed ſome Art, but very little Honeſty. He was told in the Anſwer, that ſome of thoſe Miſrepreſentations which he had made of a Papiſt, and given out for the Proteſtant Character of Popery, were *his own ignorant, or childiſh, or wilful*

Doctrines and Practices of the Church of Rome, &c. p. 10.

Miſtakes. As that *Papiſts are never permitted to hear Sermons, which they are able to underſtand; or, that they held it lawful to commit Idolatry; or, that a Papiſt believes the Pope to be his great God, and to be far above all Angels.* Theſe, I think, may paſs for Miſrepreſentations, and very childiſh and ignorant ones too: and hence the Reflecter craftily inſinuates, that we grant all his Miſrepreſentations of a Papiſt, to be ignorant, childiſh, or wilful Miſtakes; and is willing to end this Diſpute (and I very much commend him for it) upon theſe terms, that *his Character of a Papiſt miſrepreſented, ſhould be confeſſed to be made up of falſe Apprehenſions, ignorant, childiſh, and wilful Miſtakes*; and that he may *uſe the Authority* of the Anſwerer *to aſſure his Friends and Acquaintance, that whereſoever they ſhall for the future, either hear, or read ſuch things charged upon the Papiſts, they muſt give it no Credit, and eſteem it no better than the falſe Apprehenſions, ignorant, childiſh, and wilful Miſtakes of the Relators.* This would be a great Point gained indeed, and I am ſorry we cannot oblige him in it.

Reflect. p. 4.

Eſpecially, ſince he has taken the Pains to prove by great and good Authorities, that his Character of a Papiſt miſrepreſented, is not made up of ſuch childiſh Miſtakes; but is indeed what the beſt and wiſeſt Men have believed of them; and this we thank him for. He alleadges the Authority of *the Homilies*, a Book which we greatly reverence. *Fox's Book of Martyrs*, where we read, how many were burnt for not believing, as his *Papiſt miſrepreſented* believes. *Biſhop* Ridly's *Writings*, a very learned and holy Man, who may be ſuppoſed to have underſtood what Popery was, and that he was not ſo fond of miſrepreſenting, as to burn for it. *The publick Teſt*, a very

Ibid. pag. 2.

ry authentick and lasting Proof of this Matter; with several other good Authors he mentions, whose Credit is never the worse, because he hath thrust one bad Man into the Company. Nay, he has been so civil, as to grant the Answerer to be as very a Misrepresenter as the rest (and he had been a very strange Answerer, if he had not;) which argues great Modesty in him, to desire leave to use his Name and Authority to condemn the Misrepresentation; that is, to confute his own Book, (which in all the material Points, proves what he calls the Misrepresentation (I wo'nt say not to be ignorant Mistakes, but) to be the avowed Doctrine and Practice of the Church of *Rome*) which is the only way I know of, that it can be confuted; for unless he condemn it himself, I am sure this Reflecter can never confute it. Pag. 3.

Well, but what then is the meaning of all this pother and noise about this *double Character of a Papist misrepresented and represented?* Why are we so angry with what he calls the Misrepresentation, if it be true? or, what is the fault of it? This is a Mystery which ought to be explained: and I doubt our Reflecter will have no reason to glory, that he gave the occasion of it. And I shall do these two things.

I. Show you what are the Faults of the Misrepresentation.

II. That allowing for such Faults, the Papist represented (excepting some very few cases) professes to believe all that the Papist misrepresented is charged with.

I. As for the Faults of the Misrepresentation, they are briefly these.

1. That

1. That he puts ſuch things into the Character of a Papiſt, as no Man in his Wits ever charged them with; and theſe the Anſwerer calls *childiſh, and ignorant, or wilful Miſtakes.*

2. That the Opinions of Proteſtants concerning Popiſh Doctrines and Practices, and thoſe ill Conſequents which are charged, and juſtly charged upon them, are put into the Character of *a Papiſt miſrepreſented*, as if they were his avowed Doctrine and Belief; which is miſrepreſenting indeed, but is his own, not our Miſrepreſentation. We charge them with nothing, but what they expreſly profeſs to believe, and what they practiſe, and we tell them what we think of ſuch Doctrines and Practices, what their Nature, and what their Conſequences are; but do not charge them with believing as we believe, concerning theſe Matters; and therefore it is not fair to put ſuch things into a Proteſtant Character of *a Papiſt miſrepreſented.* As to give an Inſtance of a like nature; There are ſome diſſenting Proteſtants, who think it lawful to reſiſt their Prince, and take up Arms againſt him: this we ſay is Rebellion; and yet it would be a very ridiculous Miſrepreſentation of ſuch Men, to ſay, they are thoſe, who believe it lawful to rebel; for no Man believes Rebellion, no more than Idolatry, to to be lawful: and they no more believe taking up Arms in ſuch caſes to be Rebellion, than the Papiſt thinks his Worſhip of Saints and Images to be Idolatry; which ſhows how unjuſt it is, to put the Interpretations and Conſequences of Mens Opinions and Practices, which they themſelves diſown, into their Character. And tho we never do this, the Miſrepreſenter has done it for us; which makes it a falſe Character, tho every thing which is ſaid in it may be true.

3. It

3. It is ſtill ſo much the worſe, when the Interpretations and Conſequences, which are charged upon Mens Practices and Opinions, are ſet in the front of the Character, as firſt and Original Principles. As, to keep to our former Inſtance. To ſay, that Men believe Rebellion to be lawful, and therefore make no ſcruple of taking up Arms againſt their Prince; is a very different thing from ſaying, that Men believe they may lawfully take up Arms in ſome Caſes, and in doing ſo are guilty of Rebellion.

Theſe are ſome of the principal Arts our Author has uſed in drawing the Character of *a Papiſt miſrepreſented*, as I will preſently ſhow in particular. But then on the other hand, to draw a fair Character of *a Papiſt repreſented*; He, (1.) as eaſily he might, denies that he believes thoſe Interpretations and Conſequences, which we charge their Doctrines and Practices with, and which the Miſrepreſenter has put into their Character, and charges them with believing. But, (2.) he generally owns the Doctrines and Practices, which we charge them with, and attempts to vindicate them, and to put new Colours on them; ſo that the main difference between us is not in the Character, but whether their Doctrines and Practices be of ſo hainous a nature as we ſay they are, which is matter of Diſpute, not of Repreſentation. Though, (3.) in ſome Caſes he diſowns that to be the Doctrine and Belief of their Church, which manifeſtly is ſo, and has been proved on them, beyond all poſſibility of a fair Reply, by the Learned Anſwerer.

That this is the true State of the Caſe, with reference to the two-fold Character of *a Papiſt miſrepreſented and repreſented*; I come now to ſhow, which I ſhall do in theſe Characters, which he himſelf has given us of them: Only I muſt deſire the Reader, for his own ſatisfaction, to compare what I write with his Characters, for I ſhall not tranſcribe them at large, both to ſave my Labour and Paper.

I. *Of Praying to Images.*

THe Miſrepreſentation here, as to the Matter, is every word true; but yet is a falſe Character by the ſecond and third Rules of Miſrepreſentation. *A Papiſt miſrepreſented, worſhips Stocks and Stones for Gods.* We only charge them with worſhipping Images; and the fault of that, we ſay, is, (though we never charge them with ſaying or thinking ſo) that *they worſhip Stocks and Stones for Gods.* But now to miſrepreſent us in the Character of *a Papiſt miſrepreſented*, he makes us charge a Papiſt with believing his Images of Wood and Stone to be Gods; and that this is the reaſon and foundation, (not meerly the true Interpretation) of their Image-worſhip; as he adds, *And for this reaſon he erects ſtately Monuments to them in his Churches——falls down proſtrate before them, and with his eyes fixed on them, cries out, Help me* Mary, *&c.* Whereas we only charge them with worſhipping Images, and do ſay, and prove too, that in the Scripture-Notion, this is to worſhip Stocks and Stones for Gods.

Now

Now comes the Repreſenter, and he ſays, That *a Papiſt Repreſented, believes it damnable to worſhip Stocks and Stones for Gods*: That is, he does not believe, that worſhipping Images, (as we ſay, it is) is worſhipping Stocks and Stones for Gods: And whoever ſaid that they did believe this? But does he worſhip Images or not? This he grants, when he ſays, That *the honour which is exhibited to the Images, is referred to the Prototypes, which they repreſent*; which is all that can be poſſibly meant by worſhipping Chriſt, or his Saints, by Images; that they refer all that worſhip, which they pay to Images, to Chriſt, or the Saints, whom thoſe Images repreſent. Now if they refer that worſhip, which they give to the Image, to Chriſt, they muſt worſhip the Image; and this (Image-worſhip) is all we expreſsly charge them with owning. What the nature and true Interpretation of this worſhip is, which we ſay, is *worſhipping Stocks and Stones for Gods*, we will diſpute with them when they pleaſe.

II. *Of Worſhipping Saints.*

THus the Papiſt Miſrepreſented, is ſaid to *make Gods of dead men*: Whereas we only charge them with Praying to the Virgin *Mary*, and Saints departed; and this we ſay, is to make Gods of them, ſuch Gods as the Heathens made of their Inferior Dæmons, and Interceſſors between God and Men. And does the Repreſenter deny that they pray to Saints? No, but owns and defends it, as well as he can; and there we are ready to joyn Iſſue with him.

Well, but he *Confides in Saints as his Mediators and Redeemers, and expects no Bleſſing, but what is to come to him by their Merits, and through their hands.* That they truſt in Saints, as their *Redeemers*, no underſtanding Proteſtant ever yet ſaid, though they think it a great injury to the Interceſſion of our Saviour, to apply to any other Advocates, of what nature ſoever, eſpecially to think, that Chriſt, who died for us, and is our Advocate with the Father, needs any other Advocates to make him merciful and propitious to us; or that he, who merited with his own Blood, needs any additional Merits of the Saints to make his Interceſſion the more efficacious. But I am not to Diſpute now, but only Repreſent; and the Papiſt repreſented owns all that we Proteſtants charge them with. His Arguments and Colours muſt be diſmiſſed, till there be farther occaſion to conſider them.

III. *Of Addreſsing more Supplications to the Virgin* Mary, *than to* Chriſt.

WE charge them with nothing, but what is their daily practice, of ſaying ten *Ave Maries* for one *Pater noſter*, or ten Prayers to the Virgin *Mary* for one to God. And this we think (if Prayer be a ſign of Honour) is to honour her ten times more, than they do her Son, or God the Father; and if Prayer ſignifie our belief of the power, or intereſt of that Being, to whom we pray to help us, the frequency of our Prayers to the Virgin muſt ſignify, that we expect more help and relief from praying to her, than from directing our Prayers immediately to God

God or Christ; for it is natural to pray oftenest to those, from whose power or intercession (which is power too) we expect most. But now our Misrepresenter has made a very false Character of this, by putting these consequential charges into the Character, and setting them in the first place as the Reason, not the Consequences or Interpretation of their frequent Prayers to the Virgin. That *he believes the Virgin* Mary *to be much more powerful in Heaven than Christ, and that she can command him to do what she thinks good*; (which is not a Protestant but a Popish Misrepresentation, if it be one, it being found in some of their old Missals, and Modern Poets) *and for this reason he honours her more than he does her Son, or God the Father, for one Prayer he says to God, saying ten to the Holy Virgin.* And now the Representer might safely deny, that they believe the Virgin more powerful than God, or that they intend to honour her more; for we pretend not to know their private Belief and Intentions, and therefore never made this a personal charge, but only a charge upon their Practice; he owns the Practice, and we'll make good the Charge, when he pleases, not by inquiring into their private Intentions, but from the natural Interpretation of such Actions.

IV. *Of paying Divine Worship to Relicks.*

WE only charge them with giving Religious Honour to the Relicks of Saints and Martyrs, by falling prostrate, kneeling down to them, kissing them, and going in Pilgrimages to their Shrines and Sepulchers, and expecting aid and help from them,

to

to go to them *opis impetrandæ causâ*, as the Council of *Trent* directs. This is Matter of Fact, and owned by the Representer. Now we think this is to ascribe Divinity to them, if Religious Worship signifies any Divinity in the Object of Worship. This the Misrepresenter puts into the Character of a Papist, which we never did; and the Representer on the other hand denies, that they believe any such thing, which for ought I know, may be true: but the Question is, Whether they do not give a Divinity to them by worshipping them? And this we assert they do, and this they may do without believing any Divinity in them.

V. *Of the Eucharist.*

AS for worshipping the Host, we only charge them with worshipping the Consecrated Bread, which we say is Bread still; but which, they say, is the natural Body of Christ, which was born of the Virgin, and suffered on the Cross: and for so doing, some Protestants charge them with Idolatry in worshipping *a Breaden God*; and some Papists acknowledge it would be Idolatry, if what they worshipped were only Bread, and not the natural Body of Christ: but no Protestant ever gave such a Character of a Papist, That *he believes it lawful to commit Idolatry*, that *he worships and adores* what he believes only to be *a Breaden God, and the poor empty Elements of Bread and Wine.* The Question is not, what a Papist believes, but what the truth of the thing is? not whether he believes the Host to be only Bread, but whether it be so or not? not whether he believes

Idolatry

Idolatry to be lawful, but whether he be not guilty of Idolatry in worſhipping the Hoſt? and therefore this ought not to be put into the Character of a Papiſt; for thoſe who believe that he worſhips nothing but Bread and Wine, and is guilty of Idolatry in it, do not charge him with believing ſo. And therefore, the Repreſenter, who acknowledges the worſhip of the Hoſt, might very truly deny all the reſt.

As for Tranſubſtantiation, we charge them with believing no more, than what they themſelves own; That the Conſecrated Bread and Wine is changed into the natural ſubſtance of Chriſt's Fleſh and Blood; which the Miſrepreſenter very fallaciouſly calls Chriſt's being *really preſent under thoſe appearances*; that our People may not perceive the difference between *Tranſubſtantiation*, which the Church of *England* denies, and *a real preſence*, which ſhe owns, not under *the appearances* of Bread and Wine, but in the uſe of the Conſecrated Bread and Cup; which differ as much as a Bodily and Sacramental preſence. Now if this Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation be true, beſides many other Abſurdities, we ſay, Chriſt muſt have as many Bodies, as there are Conſecrated Hoſts; and that his Body muſt be on Earth, and that in fifty thouſand diſtant places at the ſame time; though the Scripture aſſures us, That he aſcended in his Body into Heaven, and is to continue there till he come to Judgment. But we do not charge the Papiſts with believing theſe Abſurdities, (for we cannot gueſs what they believe); much leſs do we charge them with believing, that there are *as many Chriſts, as many Redeemers, as there are Churches, Altars, or Prieſts.* For there is (we grant) ſome little difference between Chriſt's having many Bodies, and there being

ing many Christs. What an easy Task has the Representer to take off such Characters as these.

VI. *Of Merits and Good Works.*

HEre we only charge them with saying, as the Council of *Trent* does, That *the Good Works of justified Persons, are truly meritorious of the increase of Grace, and of Eternal Life*: And though we think this is too much for any Creature, especially a Sinner, to pretend to Merit, and know not how to reconcile Grace, and strict Merit together; yet we never charged a Papist with *believing Christ's Death and Passion to be ineffectual and insignificant, and that he has no dependance on the Merits of his Sufferings, or the Mercy of God for attaining Salvation.* For, it is plain, the Council of *Trent* owns both the Grace of God, the Merits of Christ, and the Merits of Good Works.

The Representer indeed qualifies this by saying, *That through the Merits of Christ, the good Works of a just Man proceeding from Grace, are so acceptable to God, that through his Goodness and Promise, they are truly meritorious of Eternal Life.* The Answerer alleages the 32*d* Canon, *Sess.* 6. of the Council of *Trent*, where no such Qualification is used, which yet is the Canon purposely designed to establish the Merits of goods Works. This the Reflecter grants, (*pag.* 8.) and refers us to the 26*th* Canon of that Session, where there is not one word of the Merit of good Works; and therefore, how we should learn from that Canon, in what sense good Works are said to merit, I cannot tell; but in the sixteenth Chapter

of

of that Seſſion, this Doctrine is explained at large, and there we may expect the fulleſt Account of it, which in ſhort is this.

That that Divine Vertue which flowes from Chriſt into juſtified Perſons, as from the Head to the Members, and from the Vine to the Branches, makes the good Actions of ſuch Men acceptable to God, and meritorious; and that ſuch good Works which are done in God, do ſatisfy the Divine Law, and truly and properly merit Eternal Life. That this is called our Righteouſneſs, becauſe we are juſtified by its inhering in us; and the Righteouſneſs of God, becauſe it is infuſed into us by God, through the Merits of Chriſt: and that the Goodneſs of God as to this matter, conſiſts in this, that he will have his own Gifts to be our Merits: And therefore in the 32d Canon, they pronounce an *Anathema* againſt thoſe, who ſhall ſay, that the good Works of a juſtified Man are ſo the Gift of God, as not to be his own Merits. So that though they do indeed own the Grace and Promiſe of God, and the Merits of Chriſt, as the Cauſe and Foundation of their own Merits; yet they do aſſert, that the inherent Righteouſneſs and good Works of a juſtified Man, have that intrinſick Vertue, as to ſatisfy the Divine Law, and to be truly meritorious of the increaſe of Grace and Eternal Life. This we think injurious to the Grace of God, and the Merits of Chriſt: they think it is not, and we never ſaid they did.

VII. *Of Confeſſion.*

WE charge them with making a particular Confeſſion to a Prieſt of all our Sins committed after Baptiſm, neceſſary to obtain Pardon and Forgiveneſs, and with attributing a Judicial and Prætorian Authority (ſuch as is exerciſed by Judges and Magiſtrates) to the Prieſt to forgive Sins. And tho we do not ſay, that *he believes it part of his Religion to make Gods of Men*; yet we ſay and prove it too, that this is a Power, which God has reſerved wholly to himſelf. We do not charge them with ſaying, that the Abſolution of the Prieſt is valid without any thoughts or intentions of Amendment in the Penitent: but they do ſay, that Attrition, which is but an imperfect degree of Sorrow for fear of Hell, and can produce only ſome faint and ſudden thoughts of Amendment, does qualifie Sinners for Abſolution; and we ſay, whatever the Doctrine of their Church teaches, the conſtant Practice of abſolving all that confeſs, without any apparent ſigns of Repentance, and purpoſes of a new Life, and that after many and repeated Relapſes, is apt to teach Men to place their Confidence in the Prieſt's Abſolution, without any ſerious intention to forſake their Wickedneſs.

VIII. *Of Indulgences.*

WE charge the Church of *Rome* with teaching the Pope's Power to grant Indulgences, not to commit Sin for the future, but for the Pardon of thoſe Sins which are committed; that is, for the remitting thoſe Temporal Puniſhments, which are due to Sin in Purgatory. The Abſolution of the Prieſt remits the Eternal Puniſhment of Sin, and keeps Men out of Hell; but ſtill the Temporal Puniſhment in Purgatory remains due: and this muſt be taken off, either by humane Satisfactions and Penances (of which preſently) or by the Pope's Pardon, which ſurely is a different thing from *the Relaxation of Canonical Penances*, as the Repreſenter ſtates it; for I never heard before, that Purgatory Fire was a Canonical Penance, enjoyned by the Church; for ſure the Decrees of the Church did not kindle Purgatory, and it is ſtrange the Church ſhould grant ſo many thouſand Years Pardon of Canonical Penances, (if they concern this Life) as ſome Indulgences contain, when few Men live an hundred Years in this World, and then have no need of all the reſt.

We ſay the Popes have, and do to this day ſell theſe Indulgences, at different rates, according to the nature of the Crime; and Men who have Mony, need not fear the Purgatory Fires, and Men who have none, muſt be contented to endure them: this we grant with the Repreſenter to be a great Abuſe, but it is an Abuſe of their Popes, and hardly ſeparable from the Doctrine and Practice *of Indulgences.*

IX. *Of Satisfaction.*

WE charge them with making human Penances neceſſary to ſatisfy for the Temporal Puniſhment which is due to Sin in Purgatory, when the Eternal Puniſhment is pardoned for the Merits and Satisfaction of Chriſt; which we ſay is injurious to the Satisfaction of Chriſt: for all Men muſt grant, that Chriſt had been a more perfect Saviour, had he by his Death and Paſſion delivered us from the Temporal Puniſhment of Sin in Purgatory, as well as from the Eternal Pains of Hell. Yet we do not ſay, that *they believe very injuriouſly of the Paſſion of Chriſt, that his Sufferings and Death were not ſufficiently ſatisfactory for our Sins*; and therefore think it neceſſary *to make Satisfaction for themſelves*; but that they believe, as their Church teaches them, that they muſt ſatisfy themſelves for the Temporal Puniſhment of their Sins, and this is injurious to the Satisfaction of Chriſt. We do not charge them with *evacuating Chriſt's Paſſion by relying on their own penitential Works*; but that they rely on Chriſt to ſatisfy for the Eternal Puniſhment of Sin, and on their own Satisfactions for the Temporal Puniſhment; which aſcribes indeed the better half, but not the whole, to Chriſt; and all this the Repreſenter owns.

X. *Of*

X. *Of reading the Holy Scriptures.*

WE only charge them with denying the People the uſe of the Bible in the vulgar Tongue, as every body knows they do, and as the Repreſenter owns, and defends it. And to juſtify this Practice, we ſay, many of their Divines have charged the Scripture with being a very dark, obſcure, unintelligible Book; and that it is of very dangerous conſequence to grant a liberty to the People to read it; and this we think is not much for the Credit and Reputation of the Holy Scriptures. But we do not, as the Miſrepreſenter ſays, charge the Papiſt with *believing it part of his Duty, to think meanly of the Word of God, and to ſpeak irreverently of the Scripture.* Whether denying the People the uſe of the Bible in a Language they underſtand, be an Argument of their Reſpect or Diſrepect to the Scriptures, let any Man judg; but for whatever reaſon they do it, the Effect is plain, that it keeps People in great Ignorance; and as we fear, occaſions the eternal Damnation of many Souls; though we do not ſay, as the Miſrepreſenter does, that they do it with this deſign, *That Men may be preſerved in Ignorance, and damned eternally.* But they know their own Deſigns beſt.

XI. *Of Apocryphal Books.*

HEre can be no pretence of misrepresenting, unless it be in the first clause, which he usually takes care shall contain some Misrepresentation. That *he believes it lawful to make what additions to Scripture his party thinks good.* For, as for their receiving such Apocryphal Books, as *Tobit, Judeth, Ecclesiasticus, Wisdom, and the Maccabees*, into the Canon of Scripture, which is all we charge them with, the *Representer* owns and defends it. This indeed we think to be making Additions to the Scripture, but we don't charge them with believing, that they may make what Additions to the Scripture they please; for we believe they have so much Wit, as to know it safer to do it, than to say it may be done.

XII. *Of the Vulgar Edition of the Bible.*

ALL that we charge them with here, is, that they make the Vulgar Latin Edition of the Bible so Authentick, as to allow of any Appeals to the Originals for the Interpretation of doubtful places; and we know not what Authority can make a Translation more Authentick than the Original. That this is truly charged on them, the Representer cannot deny, though the Misrepresenter makes tragical work with it; as any one may see, who will divert himself with reading that Character; which though in some parts it may have too much Truth in it, was never

never before made the Character of a Papiſt; but we muſt give them leave to ſpeak ſome blunt and bold Truths of themſelves.

XIII. *Of the Scripture as the Rule of Faith.*

XIV. *Of the Interpretation of Scripture.*

WE do not charge them with denying in expreſs words the authority of the Scripture to be a Rule, but with ſaying that which is equivalent to it, That the ſenſe of it is ſo various and uncertain, that no man can be ſure of the true meaning of it in the moſt neceſſary and fundamental Articles of the Faith, but by the Interpretation and Authority of the Church, which does effectually diveſt it of the authority of a Rule: for that is my Rule, which can and muſt direct me, which (it ſeems) is not the Scripture conſidered in it ſelf, but as interpreted by the authority of the Church, which makes the Faith and Interpretation of the Church, not the Scriptures, my immediate Rule. But why does he now complain of Miſrepreſentation? When the Repreſenter owns and juſtifies every particular of it; except it be, thoſe goodly Introductions; That *he believes it lawful, nay, that it is his Obligation to undervalue the Scripture, and take from it that Authority which Chriſt gave it*; and that *he believes his Church to be above the Scripture, and prophanely allows to her an uncontroulable Authority of being Judge of the Word of God.* For though there may be ſome truth in ſuch Conſequences as theſe from their Doctrine, yet they were never

never charged upon them by us, as their Principles, or Faith: Which is the chief Art he uſes in drawing up theſe Miſrepreſentations.

XV. *Of Traditions.*

WE charge them with making ſome unwritten Traditions of equal authority with the Scripture, and believing them with a Divine Faith. This we ſay, derogates from the perfection of the Scripture, or the written Word of God. For if our Rule be partly the written, partly the unwritten Word; then the Scripture (or written Word) is but part of the Rule; and part of a Rule cannot be a whole and perfect Rule. And we ſay, That theſe unwritten Traditions are but *humane Ordinations, and Traditions of men:* but we do not ſay a Papiſt believes them to be Humane, but Divine, though unwritten, Traditions: and therefore, though we affirm, that they give equal authority to ſuch Traditions as are in truth no better than humane Ordinations, *as to the Scriptures themſelves*; yet we do not ſay, that they admit what they believe to be only humane Traditions, to ſupply the defects of Scripture, allowing equal authority to them, as to the Scriptures themſelves; which is the only Miſrepreſentation in this Character, all the reſt being owned by the Repreſenter himſelf, who then had very little cauſe to complain of Miſrepreſenting.

XVI. *Of*

XVI. *Of Councils.*

THe difference between the *Misrepreſenter* and *Repreſenter* in this Article, is no more but this, That the *Papiſt Misrepreſented* is ſaid to receive new Additions to his Creed from the Definitions and Authority of General Councils, and to embrace them with a Divine Faith. The *Papiſt Repreſented*, owns the Authority of General Councils, as well as the other, and receives all their Definitions, and believes them as firmly; but though they define ſuch Doctrines for Articles of Faith, as were never heard of in the Chriſtian Church, and leaſt were never put into any Chriſtian Creed before, yet he will not believe them to be Additions to his Faith, or to what was taught by Chriſt and his Apoſtles? But Pope *Pius* the 4th his Creed muſt be the Faith of the Church from the Apoſtles days. Now here I fancy our Author miſtook his ſide, for the Papiſt Repreſented has much the worſe Character, that he is ſo void of all ſence, that he cannot tell which is moſt, twelve, or four and twenty Articles in a Creed. This is a hard caſe, that Men muſt believe all the Definitions of their Councils, but though they ſee their Creed increaſe every day, muſt never own that their Faith receives any Additions. However, I think, he has no reaſon here to complain of Miſrepreſenting, ſince he owns all that any Proteſtant charges him with, ſuch an Implicit Faith in General Councils, as receives all

their Definitions, and rather than fail in defiance of Senſe and Hiſtory, will believe that to be the old Faith, which was never defined till yeſterday.

XVII. *Of Infallibility in the Church.*

THe Miſrepreſenter ſays, a Papiſt *believes that the Paſtors and Prelates of his Church are infallible*; which, if it be underſtood of every particular Paſtor and Prelate, no Proteſtant ever charged them with; and therefore the Repreſenter might very ſafely deny it; and thus is all the difference between them, except it be this, That what the *Miſrepreſenter* barely affirms, the *Repreſenter* endeavours to prove, *viz.* the Infallibility of the Church, at leaſt, as aſſembled in General Councils; and yet this muſt be called *Miſrepreſenting* too; a Word, which (I ſuppoſe) muſt have ſome ſecret Charm in it to Convert Hereticks.

XVIII. *Of the Pope.*

HEre the *Miſrepreſenter* is very Rhetorical and facetious, and we may give him leave to be a little pleaſant with his own Univerſal Paſtor. He ſays, the Papiſt *believes the Pope to be his great God*; how great I cannot tell, but ſome Flatterers of the Papal greatneſs, have given the Title of God to the Pope,

Pope, and poſſibly ſome Proteſtants have repeated the ſame after them, but never charged the Papiſts with believing it; much leſs do they charge them with denying *Chriſt to be the Head of the Church*, or with ſaying, *That the Pope has taken his place*; but we do charge them with making the Pope the Univerſal Paſtor and Head of the Church under Chriſt: and this (I hope) is no Miſrepreſenting; for it is aſſerted, and proved after this Faſhion, by the Repreſenter. But why is the Pope's perſonal Infallibility put into the Character of a Papiſt Miſrepreſented? Why not as well the Infallibility of General Councils? Since he grants ſome Papiſts do believe the Pope's Infallibility, and ſuch Papiſts are not Miſrepreſented by charging them with it; and there are others, who do not believe the Councils Infallibility without the Pope, which therefore cannot be an inherent Infallibility in them. The truth is, the Infallibility of the Church is the Faith of a Papiſt, but in whom this Infallibility is ſeated, whether in the Diffuſive, Repreſentative, or Virtual Church, in Pope or Council, or the whole Body of Chriſtians, is not agreed among them. But neither of theſe are Miſrepreſentations of a Papiſt, unleſs you tell, what particular ſort of Papiſts you repreſent; and then, I am ſure, you miſrepreſent a Jeſuit, if you make him deny the Pope's Infallibility.

XIX. *Of Diſpenſations.*

HEre, I confeſs, the *Miſrepreſenter* and *Repreſenter* do flatly contradict each other; and I am heartily glad to hear the Repreſenter ſo fully diſown thoſe Principles, which are deſtructive to all Religion, as well as to Humane Societies; and ſhould be more glad ſtill had there been never any foundation for what he calls the *Miſrepreſentation*. However, this he does very ill in, to charge Proteſtants with this Miſrepreſentation of a Papiſt; for I know no Proteſtant that charges theſe Principles upon Papiſts in general: but I hope it is no *Miſrepreſentation* to charge thoſe Men with ſuch Principles, who charge themſelves with them; and I ſuppoſe our Author will not ſay, that theſe Principles were never taught or defended by any Papiſt. Whenever he is hardy enough to ſay this, I'll direct him to ſuch Popiſh Authors as will ſatisfy him about it.

XX. *Of*

XX. *Of the Deposing Power.*

HEre the dispute between the Misrepresenter and Representer, is only this, Whether *the Deposing Power* be the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*? For it's granted on all hands, that it is, or has been, the Doctrine and Practice of many Popes, Divines, and Canonists; but that it has been condemned by other Divines, and some famous Universities, tho I do not hear, that it was ever condemned by any Pope. But what does he think of this being decreed by General Councils? Does not this make it the Doctrine of their Church? This he says nothing to here, but we shall meet with it by and by in his *Reflections*, and therefore will dismiss this Cause till then.

XXI. *Of Communion in one kind.*

HEre we charge the Church of *Rome* with altering the Institution of Christ in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper; for Christ instituted it in both kinds, but the Church of *Rome* denies the Cup to the Layity: but yet we do not say, That a Papist *believes that he is no longer obliged to obey Christ's Commands, than his Church will give him leave*; but

we

we ſay, that herein he tranſgreſſes the Inſtitutions of our Saviour, to comply with the Innovations of his Church. And does the Repreſenter deny this? Yes, he denies, that they alter the Inſtitution of Chriſt; for (he ſays) Chriſt did not command them to receive in both kinds, but left it indifferent. But does he deny, that the Church of *Rome* takes away the Cup from the People? No, this he owns and juſtifies. Wherein then do we Miſrepreſent them? For we charge them only with taking away the Cup: whether this be agreeable, or contrary to the Inſtitution of our Saviour, is not Matter of Repreſentation, but of Diſpute.

XXII. *Of the Maſs.*

HEre we charge them with making the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper (as the Council of *Trent* defines) *a true proper propitiatory Sacrifice for the Quick and the Dead.* And this, we ſay, infers *an inſufficiency in the Sacrifice, made by Chriſt upon the Croſs.* For if Chriſt by his Death upon the Croſs had made a complete and perfect Atonement and Propitiation for ſins, by his *once offering himſelf*, what occaſion can there be for the repetition of ſuch a Propitiatory Sacrifice? for the only reaſon the Apoſtle aſſigns, why the legal Sacrifices were ſo often repeated, was, becauſe they could not *make the Comers thereunto perfect, Hebr.* 10. But we do not charge them with *believing an inſufficiency in the Sacrifice, made by Chriſt on the Croſs.* Much leſs

do

do we say, that they are taught, wholly to rely on the Sacrifice of the Mass, and *to neglect the Passion of Christ, and to put no hopes in his Merits, and the Work of our Redemption.* The first is a Consequence which we charge upon their Doctrine and Practice, but do not charge them with believing it. The second was never charged on them, that I know of before. So, that if there be any Misrepresentation here, it must be in charging them, That they believe the Sacrifice of the Mass to be *a true proper propitiatory Sacrifice for the Quick and Dead.* But this is the very definition of their Council, and an Anathema pronounced against those, who deny it: and this the Representer acknowledges, though he conceals as much of it as he can, calling it *a Commemorative Sacrifice, representing in an unbloody manner,* (what, when the Blood of Christ is actually shed in the Sacrifice of the Mass, is it still an unbloody Sacrifice) *the bloody Sacrifice which was offered for us upon the Cross:* But is it a Propitiatory Sacrifice or not? Does it make an actual Propitiation for our Sins? If they do not own this, then indeed we misrepresent them; if they do (as they must, if they own the Council of *Trent*) we represent them truly; and whether the Consequences we charge upon this Doctrine, be true or false, that is no part of the Representation: we may argue ill, but we represent right; though we are ready to justify that too whenever they please.

XXIII. *Of*

XXIII. *Of Purgatory.*

TO carry on the humour of *Misrepresenting*, he complains of *Misrepresenting* here too; when all that is charged on them is, the belief of Purgatory, a middle place between Heaven and Hell, where Souls departed, who are acquitted from the Sentence of Eternal Punishment, must undergo a Temporal Punishment for those Sins, which were not expiated in this Life. That there is such a State, the *Representer* most industriously and zealously proves: Why then is the belief of Purgatory thrust into the Character of *a Papist misrepresented*? All that I can perceive is, That the Misrepresentation consists, not in charging them with believing a Purgatory, but with believing it *contrary to all Reason, the Word of God, and all Antiquity*; for the Representer says, *he believes it damnable to admit of any thing for Faith, that is contrary to Reason, the word of God, and all Antiquity*. *Damnable* is a very dangerous word, especially when it is applied to *believing things contrary to Reason*; and therefore though it may serve now and then to bluster with, I would advise him to use it sparingly: but though I must confess, we think, that they do believe a Purgatory, and a great many other things, which are contrary to Reason, Scripture, and Antiquity; yet we do not say, that they admit any thing for Faith, which they believe contrary to Reason, Scripture, and Antiquity; and therefore this is no part of their Character, and therefore no Mirepresentation.

XXIV. *Of*

XXIV. *Of praying in an unknown Tongue.*

HEre indeed I meet with ſomewhat of Miſrepreſentation. For he ſays, *He* (the Papiſt miſrepreſented) *is counſelled by his Church to be preſent at Sermons, but never permitted to hear any he is able to underſtand; they being all delivered in an unknown Tongue.* This is miſrepreſenting with a witneſs. But no Proteſtant ever charged them with preaching, as well as praying in Latin: but the meaning of this is eaſily underſtood, to perſwade thoſe People, who place all their Religion in hearing Sermons, that it is no matter what Language their Prayers are in (which they care not much for hearing when they are in Engliſh) if they have but Engliſh Sermons to entertain their Curioſity and itching Ears. And it is, I confeſs, a cunning Suggeſtion, and I hope will warn all ſober Chriſtians to joyn more devoutly in the Prayers of the Church, which they do underſtand, and that will teach them the difference between an Engliſh Liturgy, and Latin Maſs-Book.

The reſt of the Character only charges them with praying in Latin, a Language which the People do not underſtand; and therefore, whatever other devout Thoughts they may have, they cannot joyn with the Prieſt in offering up the ſame Petitions to God, when they do not underſtand what it is he ſays: All this is granted on all hands to be true, and yet this alſo which the Repreſenter owns, is called miſrepreſenting.

XXV. *Of the Second Commandment.*

WE charge them with making the second Commandment, which forbids *the Worſhip of Images*, only a part and branch of the firſt, which forbids *the Worſhip of other Gods*, which is deſigned to obſcure the true ſenſe and interpretation of that Law, and to excuſe all Men from the Sin of Image-worſhip, who are not ſo ſenſleſs to believe the Images to be Gods. And yet not thinking themſelves ſafe in this, they dare not truſt the People with the ſecond Commandment, but leave it out of their Catechiſms and Manuals, and ſuch Offices as are like to come into Peoples hands. Is this charge true, or is it not? The Repreſenter grants the whole, and excuſes it; thinks the ſecond Commandment too great a burden to Mens Memories, and a needleſs Explication of the firſt: but whatever may be ſaid for or againſt it, if the Charge be true, why is this called miſrepreſenting?

XXVI. *Of Mental Reſervations.*

THE Repreſenter himſelf grants all that we charge them with; not that this Doctrine was ever defined by any general Council, or that it was univerſally received and practiſed by all of that Communion, but that it has been taught and defended by great

great numbers of their Divines, and Casuists (not to take notice of any greater Authorities now) and practised, as occasion served, by themselves and their Disciples. To charge all Papists in general with this, would indeed be a Misrepresentation, but I hope it is none to charge those who are really guilty.

XXVII. *Of a Death-bed Repentance.*

WE do not think so ill of any Sect or Profession of Christians, but that they will all grant, that Men ought to live, as well as die in the Faith and Fear, and Obedience of God; nor did we ever charge the Church of *Rome* with teaching otherwise: but then we say, that Men may teach such Doctrines, as may give great encouragement to Sinners to take their fill of Sensual Lusts, and to put off the thoughts of Repentance to a Death-bed; and this indeed we think the Church of *Rome* has done; but do not charge her with teaching her Children to make such an ill use of these Doctrines, or with encouraging them to live wickedly in their Health, and to repent when they are sick. This is no part of the Character which we give of a Papist; but we alleadg it only to convince Men, how dangerous the Communion of such a Church is, which has found out so many easy ways to keep good Catholicks out of Hell, as without her teaching any such Consequence, is very apt to incline Men, who

believe them, to take greater liberties than are consistent with the safety of their Souls.

XXVIII. *Of Fasting.*

WE do not blame the Church of *Rome* for enjoyning Fasting, which is a very useful Duty, when it serves the true ends and purposes of Religion; nor do we deny, that a Papist may fast very devoutly and religiously; but we say the common Practice of Fasting among Papists, is far enough from being religious; an Ecclesiastical Fast being very reconcilable with the greatest Excesses: and though this be the fault of the Men, and we charge none with it, but those who are guilty, which, I suppose, is not misrepresenting, yet their Church has given occasion to it by making Fasting to signify Eating, so they do but abstain from all Meats forbidden by the Church; and their Casuists have stated this matter so loosely, that no Men who have not an Antipathy to the best Fish, and most delicious Wines and Sweet-meats, need do any great Penance in Fasting; and it is hard we cannot be allowed to complain of these Abuses without being charged as Misrepresenters.

XXIX. *Of Diviſions and Schiſms in the Church.*

IN this Point we are not the Aſſailants, but are only on the defenſive part; when they make it an Argument againſt the Reformation, that there are ſo many Diviſions and different Opinions among us: We deſire them to look home, and to the eternal ſhame of a pretended Infallibility, conſider how many different Opinions there are among themſelves. We are all agreed in following the ſame Rule of Faith, as he ſays they are, only our Rule indeed differs; we take the Scripture to be the ſafeſt Rule, and we all agree, that it is ſo; they the Senſe, and Judgment, and Faith of their Church; and I doubt not, but we ſhall as ſoon agree in the Senſe of every Text of Scripture as they will, what that Authority in the Church is to which they muſt yield, what theſe Traditions are they muſt receive, and what is the true Senſe and Interpretation of the Definitions and Decrees of their Councils. We agree in the Articles of the Apoſtles Creed, which was the ancient Faith of the Church; and our Differences as to matters of Faith, are as meer School-Diſputes, as they ſay theirs are, and in moſt caſes the ſame; as about Predeſtination, Election and Reprobation, the Efficacy of Grace, and Free-will. We have ſome indeed which they have not; and they have

have ſome that we have not; as about the the immaculate Conception, the Infallibility of the Pope, &c. They have a way indeed to confine theſe Diſputes to their Schools, which we have not, and that is to keep the Common People in Ignorance, which will effectually cure their diſputing; but we think it better that our People ſhould underſtand their Religion, tho they diſpute a little about it. Now we are ſo far from miſrepreſenting in this caſe, that we do not think this a reaſonable Objection againſt either ſide; but if they will needs be talking of our Diviſions, to perſwade People for Peace and Unities ſake to take Sanctuary in an Infallible Church, they muſt give us leave to tell our People, that Infallibility, tho it ſounds big, does not do ſuch feats in the Church of *Rome* as is pretended. Their Common People indeed do not diſpute about Religion, becauſe they know little of it; and their Divines and Scholars agree juſt as our Divines do, or it may be not ſo well: And this is all the miſrepreſenting we are guilty of in this matter.

XXX. *Of Friers and Nuns.*

WHerein the Miſrepreſentation he complains of here conſiſts, I cannot gueſs; Is it, that Papiſts are taught to have an high eſteem of Friers and Nuns? This he himſelf owns; Is it, that many who enter into this religious courſe of Life, live very irreligiouſly? this he alſo confeſſes,

feſſes, and apologizes for; and theſe two things make the Character: I ſuppoſe he forgot ſomething elſe, which was to be the Miſrepreſentation.

XXXI. *Of Wicked Principles and Practices.*

HEre alſo I cannot find wherein the Miſrepreſentation conſiſts. There are a great many ill things ſaid to be committed by ſome Perſons of the Roman Communion; this the Repreſenter grants, and excuſes the Church from the ſcandal of ſuch Examples; how well is not my buſineſs at preſent to enquire, who am no farther concerned, than to ſee Right done them, that they be not miſrepreſented.

XXXII. *Of Miracles.*

HEre the Papiſt is charged with believing *a great many idle Stories, and ridiculous Inventions, in favour of his Saints, which he calls Miracles.* And if this be a Miſrepreſentation, they themſelves are guilty of it; for theſe Popiſh Miracles were not invented by Proteſtants, but publiſhed by themſelves, who are the only Perſons that ever ſaw them; but their believing ſuch Miracles (which I hardly think a wiſe Man among them does, tho they are willing the People ſhould) is the leaſt thing

thing in it: for bare Credulity, which does no hurt, is very innocent, though very silly; but to recommend such Miracles as credible, which are no better than Impostures, is an injury to common Christianity, and makes Men suspect the Miracles of Christ and his Apostles to be Cheats too; and it is a horrid abuse of Christianity to coin such Miracles to nurse Men up in Superstition, which is the general design of them: So that here the matter is not represented so bad as it is, which is the only Misrepresentation I have hitherto met with.

XXXIII. *Of Holy Water.*

THe Papist misrepresented, is said *highly to approve the superstitious use of many inanimate things, and to attribute wonderful Effects to Holy Water, Blessed Candles, Holy Oil, and Holy Bread.* The Papist represented, *disproves all sort of Superstition, but yet is taught to have an esteem for Holy Water*, &c. So that when we charge them with using such Religious Charms as these, we do not misrepresent them, for they own they do so; but the Misrepresentation is in charging these usages with Superstition; but if this be misrepresenting, it is not to misrepresent a Papist, but to misrepresent Popery: We charge them with nothing but what they own and justify, but we charge their Doctrines and Practices with such Guilt, as they will not own; but this is not matter of Representation, but of Dispute.

XXXIV. *Of*

XXXIV. *Of breeding up People in Ignorance.*

WE do indeed charge them with breeding people up, and keeping them in Ignorance, because they deny them the means and opportunity of knowledge; will not suffer them to read the Bible, nor say their publick Prayers in a Language, which they understand, and forbid them to read such Books as might inform them better. Is this true or not? If it be, then though they may have a great many Learned Men among them, their Learned Men may keep the People in Ignorance. We deny not, but they do instruct People after a fashion, but yet they take care to let them know no more, than they are pleased to teach them, and they may be very ignorant for all that. But I think, though this be a very great fault, it belongs neither to the Character of a Papist misrepresented nor represented; but is the fault of their Governours, their Popes, and Bishops and Priests; and I charitably hope, it will be some excuse to the Ignorant and deluded People.

XXXV. *Of the Uncharitableneſs of the Papiſts.*

WE here charge them with damning all, who are not of their Church and Communion; and this we think very Uncharitable. For it damns far the greateſt number of Chriſtians in the World. The Repreſenter does not deny, that they do this; only endeavours to prove, that it is not Uncharitableneſs in them to do it. I am not to diſpute this point with him now, but if this be his charity, I like it as little, as I do his Faith.

XXXVI. *Of Ceremonies and Ordinances.*

WE charge them with corrupting the Chriſtian Worſhip by a great number of Ceremonies and Ordinances, which we judge uſeleſs, burdenſom, or Superſtitious, unworthy of the ſimplicity and ſpirituality of the Chriſtian Worſhip, and a great infringement of true Chriſtian liberty. That they do command great numbers of ſuch Ceremonies, the Repreſenter grants; and therefore we do not miſrepreſent them in it: whether they do well or ill in this, is no part of the Character, but the matter in Controverſie between us.

XXXVII. *Of Innovations in matters of Faith.*

AND ſo is his laſt Character about Innovations, a meer diſpute, and cannot be made a Character, unleſs we ſhould charge them with believing thoſe Doctrines to be Innovations, which we ſay, and prove to be ſo; but never charge them with believing ſo: at this rate he may make Characters of a Papiſt miſrepreſented, out of all the diſputes which are between us. It is but ſaying, what we charge their Doctrines and Practices with, and this makes the Character of a Papiſt miſrepreſented; and it is but denying this charge in another Column, and then you have a Character of a Papiſt repreſented: if we charge them with believing any thing, which they do not believe, or with doing what they do not, then indeed we miſrepreſent them: but he has not given any one inſtance of this in all his 37 Characters. But if to condemn their Doctrines and Practices, if to charge them with contradicting the evidence of Senſe, of Reaſon, and of Scripture, that they are innovations in Faith, and corruptions of the Chriſtian Worſhip, be to miſrepreſent them; we confeſs we are ſuch miſrepreſenters, and, for ought I can perceive, are like to continue ſo; unleſs they have ſome better arguments in reſerve, than ever we yet ſaw; for *Character-making* will not do it: ſo that all this cry about miſrepreſenting is come to juſt nothing. We like a Papiſt as little, as he has repreſented him, as when we ſee him repreſented by a Proteſtant Pen; for

there is no difference at all in the Parts, Proportions, and Features, though there is some difference in the Colours. A Papist is the same in both Characters, only with this difference, that a Protestant thinks him a very bad Christian; and a Papist, we may be sure, thinks him a very good one. A Protestant thinks the Faith and Worship of a Papist to be contrary to Sense, Reason, and Scripture, and the Faith and Practice of the Primitive Church; a Papist thinks it agreeable to all these Rules, or can give a Reason why it should not. And therefore I could not but smile at his concluding Proposal,

Page 19. *to convince us, that the Faith, as he has represented it, is really the Faith of the Papist,* (which we believe is true, excepting the deposing Doctrine, and some few other Points, which I have already observed) *that the decision of this whole Affair depend upon an experience. Do but you, or any Friend for you, give your assent to these Articles of Faith in the very form and manner as I have stated them, and if upon your Request, you are not admitted into the Communion of the Roman Catholicks, and owned to believe aright in all those Points, I'll then confess, that I have abused the World, &c.* and truly I am apt to think so too; but we must like his Faith better, before we shall make the Experiment.

Secondly, But it is time now to proceed to his other Reflections, which concern the Rule, whereby the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome* is to be known. For though the Faith of their Church be infallible, it is wonderful hard to know what their Faith is. Now his Reflections may be reduced

ced to two general Heads. First, Concerning the Authority of the Council of *Trent* in *England*, and the Rules of expounding it. Secondly, Concerning the false Rules the Answerer has used in judging of the Faith and Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*.

First, Concerning the Authority of the Council of *Trent*, and the Rules of expounding it. The Author of *A Papist misrepresented and represented*, in drawing the Character of a Papist represented, professes to follow the Doctrine *prescribed in the Council of* Trent. This the Answerer says, *he finds no fault with*, and therefore would not ask, *How the Council of* Trent *comes to be the rule and measure of Doctrine to any here, where it was never received*, p. 9. ed. 1. To this the Reflecter answers, *That the Council of* Trent *is received here, and all the Catholick World over, as to all its definitions of Faith*, p. 5. By which, I suppose, he means, that all *English* Catholicks do own the Authority of the Council of *Trent*, and take their Rule of Faith from it; but this is not, what the Answerer means by that Question; Whether *English* Catholicks singly for themselves, and in their private Capacities, own the Doctrine of the Council of *Trent*; but by what publick Act of Church or State it has been received in *England*, as it has been in other Catholick Countries. The Church of *England* had no Representatives in that Council, nor did by any after Act own it's Authority, and therefore it is no authentick and obligatory Rule here.

The Introduction.

Page 5.

But

But allowing the Authority of this rule to determine, what is Popery, and what not, which the Anſwerer allows reaſonable enough, conſidering that its definitions of Faith are received all the Catholick World over, as the Reflecter ſaith, the greater difficulty is about the Interpretation of this rule. For not only we Hereticks interpret this Council a little differently from our Author, but Catholick Doctors themſelves cannot agree about it. Now when other good Catholicks differ from him in explaining the definitions and Decrees of this Council, why muſt his ſenſe, and not theirs, paſs for the character of a Papiſt?

Pope *Pius* IV. did ſtrictly forbid any private Man to interpret the Council according to his own private ſenſe and opinion; but if any diſpute happened about the true meaning of their definitions and Decrees, he reſerved the deciſion of it to the Apoſtolick See; and a very wiſe Decree it was, conſidering that many of their definitions were penned in looſe and ambiguous words on purpoſe to compoſe the diſputes and differences of their Divines (who were many times very troubleſome to the Council) that each party might think their own ſenſe favoured; but then conſidering what ill conſequence this might be of, to ſuffer them to diſpute the ſenſe of the Council, and wreſt it to countenance their private opinions, which would rather inflame, than compoſe theſe diſputes (a freſh example of which, they had in the diſpute between *Catharinus* and *Soto* while the Council was ſitting) the Pope very prudently forbids this, that if they would ſtill wrangle among themſelves, yet the authority of the

the Council might not be concerned in it. But now if their Doctors do differ ſtill about the ſenſe of the Council, and affix their private opinions on it, and Popes think fit rather to connive at theſe differences, than to undertake to determine them, why muſt any one of theſe different opinions be ſo made the character of a Papiſt, as to exclude the other? If ſome, and thoſe of greateſt note and authority in the Church, and not inferiour in number (to ſay no more) are for the depoſing Doctrine, and others againſt it, why muſt thoſe only be thought Papiſts, who deny this depoſing power, and not thoſe alſo, who aſſert it? Whether it be the Faith of the Church or not, is a diſpute between them: and though our Author denies, that it is the Faith of the Church, and therefore that a Papiſt is not bound to believe it; yet thoſe who are for the depoſing Power, aſſert that it is the Faith of the Church, and that with much greater reaſon than he denies it; and what authority has he to decide this diſpute, and who gave him this authority? Does not *his repreſentation of a Papiſt*, in this point, *depend upon his own private ſenſe and opinion.*

No, he ſays, *He is ſo far from being guilty of this fault of interpreting the Council of* Trent *in his own ſenſe? that he has only delivered it, as it is interpreted to him, and to all their Church in the Catechiſm* ad Parochos, *compoſed and ſet forth by the order of the Council and* Pius V. *for the inſtruction of the faithful in their Chriſtian duty touching Faith and good Manners, in conformity to the ſenſe of the Council:* And is he ſure, that all his repreſentations are conformable to the ſenſe of this Catechiſm? Page. 6.

May

May he not play tricks with the Catechiſm, and expound that by a private ſpirit, as well as the Council?

Well, but *he appealed in his concluſion to* Veron's *rule of Faith.* And what of that? How comes *Veron*'s rule to be ſo Authentick, as to juſtifie any interpretation, which agrees with it? Why did not our Author appeal to his own character? which may have as much authority, for ought I know, as *Veron*'s rule. But beſides *Veron*, he appeals to the *Biſhop of* Condom, *who drew up a like character in* Paris *of the belief of a Papiſt.* And what is the authority of this Biſhops character? For Biſhops have no more authority to expound the Council of *Trent* (which is intirely reſerved to the Apoſtolick See) than private Doctors. Yes, the Biſhop of *Condom*'s Book has all requiſite authority, becauſe the ſecond Edition *was publiſhed with ſeverul diſtinct* Page 7. *atteſtations of many Biſhops and Cardinals, and of the preſent Pope himſelf, wherein they at large approve the Doctrine contained in that Treatiſe for the Faith and Doctrine of the Church of* Rome, *and conform to the Council of* Trent. I ſhall take it for granted, that it is, as the Reflecter ſays, but what then? Had not Cardinal *Bellarmin*'s controverſies as great an atteſtation as the Biſhop of *Condom*'s *Expoſition of the Doctrine of the Catholick Church*? Did he not dedicate them to Pope *Sixtus* V. and that with the Popes leave and good liking, *Te annuente*, as he himſelf ſays? and how much inferiour is this to a Teſtimonial under the Popes hand? And why then are not *Bellarmin*'s Controverſies as authentick

a rule

a rule for the exposition of the Catholick Faith, as the Bishop of *Condom's*?

But *Melchior Canus*, to whom the Reflecter refers us, would have taught him, that the Popes private approbation is as little worth, as any other Bishops. *That the name of the Apostolick See does not signifie the Pope in his personal capacity, but acting as it becomes the Chair; that is, not giving his own private sense, but proceeding in Council, with the advice of good and learned Men. And therefore that is not to be accounted the judgment of the Apostolick See, which is given only by the* Bishop *of* Rome *privately and inconsiderately, or with the advice only of some few of his own mind, but what he determines upon a due examination of the thing, by the advice and counsel of many wise Men.* And therefore I doubt, notwithstanding the present Popes approbation, he is a little out, when he calls this the *Authority of the Apostolick See.*

Sedis Apostolicæ nomen, non solum summum Pontificem significat, sed ipsum, ut facit ea, quæ ad Cathedram spectant; hoc est, quatenus non ex suo, sed ex consilio bonorum virorum & doctorum procedit. Ita sedis Apostolicæ judicia intelligi, non quæ occulte, malitiosè, inconsultè, per solum Romanum Episcopum, aut etiam cum paucis sibi faventibus, proferuntur; sed quæ ab eo ex consilio plurimorum virorum sapientium plenè prius re examinata prodeunt. Canus de Auct. Concil. libr. 5.

But the Answerer did not only charge him in general with interpreting the Council of *Trent* by his own private sense and opinions, but gave some particular instances of it, and I must now consider, how the Reflecter takes off this charge.

1. *As to Invocation of Saints, he limits their power of* helping us to Prayers only, whereas he grants *the Council mentions their Aid and Assistance, as well as Prayers.* And the only vindication he thinks necessary to make for this is, *that no other means of their aiding and assisting us, is expressed in the Council, or in the Catechism* ad Parochos, *besides that of* Page. 7.

their Prayers; and it is thus limited by the Biſhop of Condom *on this Subject with the Pope and Cardinals approbation.* But though the Council does not ſpecifie, what other *aid and aſſiſtance* we may expect from the Saints beſides their Prayers; yet it mentions *Aid and Aſſiſtance*, without limiting it to the aſſiſtance of their Prayers; and the Anſwerer (*P.* 25.) told him what reaſon he had to believe, that neither the *Trent* Council nor Catechiſm did intend any ſuch limitation: but this he thought fit to take no notice of, for it had been very troubleſome to anſwer it. As for the Biſhop of *Condom*, though his authority is nothing, yet I do not find, that he limits *their aid and aſſiſtance* only to their Prayers for us; for after repeating the Decree of the Council, *That it is good and uſeful to invoke the Saints by way of ſupplication, and to have recourſe to their ſuccors and aſſiſtances*, &c. he quietly drops the laſt clauſe without ſaying any thing of it, and only tells us, *It is evident that to invoke the Saints according to the intent of this Council, is to reſort to their Prayers, for the obtaining the bleſſings and benefits of God by Jeſus Chriſt.* And no doubt but this is true; but the Council ſpeaks not only of *invoking the Saints*, but *of flying to their aid and aſſiſtance*: and pray what does that ſignifie? That he had no mind to tell us, and when he ſays nothing of it, how comes our Reflecter to know, that he limits it to their Prayers?

As for the point of merit, I have already conſidered that, though I do not ſee upon ſecond thoughts, how the Anſwerer is concerned in it; for he does not alledge the 32 Canon to oppoſe, what he aſſerts, that good works are meritorious by the goodneſs and promiſe of God, but for the ſake of the *Anathema*, which it denounces againſt thoſe, who deny, that

that good works are truly meritorious of the increaſe of Grace and eternal life: And therefore his next inſtance is *the Popes perſonal Infallibility.* This our Reflecter denys, and makes it the Character of a Papiſt miſrepreſented to aſſert it: and yet there are as many Papiſts, who believe the Popes Infallibility, as there are, who deny it; and were they to make Characters, to deny the Popes perſonal Infallibility, would certainly be one Character of a Papiſt miſrepreſented: But he ſays, this is only *a School-debate,* and *not matter of Faith, becauſe not poſitively determined by any general Council.* And yet whoever reads Cardinal *Bellarmin* and ſeveral others on this ſubject, would think they made a matter of Faith of it. But I would ask him, Whether the Infallibility of the Church be an Article of Faith? If it be, my next queſtion is, In what general Council it was defined? It ſeems indeed to be taken for granted in ſome later Councils, but I am yet to ſeek, what General Council has poſitively defined it. I am ſure *Bellarmin* and other learned Divines of the Roman Communion, who uſe all manner of arguments, they can think of, to prove the Infallibility of the Church, never alledge the authority of any Council for it: So that it ſeems infallibility it ſelf was never determined by any General Council; and if the Infallibility of the Church be matter of Faith, though it were never defined by any General Council, why may not the Infallibility of the Pope be ſo too? nay how does our Reflecter come to believe the Infallibility of a General Council? for this is no more defined by any General Council, than the Infallibility of the Pope is. Page 8.

If there muſt be Infallibility in the Church ſomewhere, I think, the Pope, whom they acknowledge to be the ſupream Paſtor, has the faireſt Pretences

to it. For Infallibility ought in reaſon to accompany the greateſt and moſt abſolute Power. If we muſt have an infallible Judge of Controverſies, it muſt be the Pope, not a Council; becauſe if you place Infallibility in a Council, the Church has no infallible Judge any longer than while the Council is ſitting. For the Definitions and Decrees of Councils, how infallible ſoever they are, yet certainly cannot be an infallible Judge, which they will not allow to the Scriptures themſelves. And therefore if the Church can never be without an infallible Judge, he who is the ſupreme Paſtor and Judge muſt be infallible. Now this being the Caſe, I deſire to know, why our Reflecter prefers the Infallibility of a General Council, before the Pope's perſonal Infallibility? how one comes to be matter of Faith, and not the other? or if neither of them be, why one makes the Character of a Papiſt miſrepreſented, the other of a Papiſt repreſented. For though he pretends *not to deliver his own private Sentiment or Opinion concerning this Point*; but only to relate *matter of Fact*, yet he has ſo cunning a way of telling his Tale, as to let every body know, which ſide he is of. For we may gueſs, that he does not over admire the *Papiſt miſrepreſented*, and then he cannot be very fond of the Pope's Infallibility, which is part of that Character.

And now I come to the *Goliath-argument*, as he calls it, concerning the *depoſing Power*, which he puts into this form. *In my Character of a Papiſt repreſented, I pretend to declare the Faith of a Roman-Catholick, as it is defined and delivered in allowed General Councils; and yet though the depoſing Doctrine has been as evidently declared in ſuch Councils, as ever Purgatory and Tranſubſtantiation were in that of* Trent;

Page 9.

Trent; *yet still with me, it is no Article of our Faith.* This indeed is an untoward Argument, and I wish him well delivered, and I think he does very prudently to keep at a distance with a sling and a stone, and not venture to grapple with it. To this he thus replies:

"I answer it in short, that though all Doctrinal "Points defined in any approved General Council, "and proposed to the Faithful to be received under "an *Anathema*, are with us so many Articles of "Faith, and are obligatory to all of our Commu- "nion; yet not so of every other Matter declared "in such a Council: there being many things treat- "ed of, and resolved on in such an Assembly, which "concern not the Faith of the Church, but only "some matter of Discipline, Government, or other "more particular Affair; and these Constitutions "and Decrees are not absolutely obligatory, as is evi- "dent in the Council of *Trent*——whose Decrees of "Doctrine are as much acknowledged here by Catho- "licks in *England* or *Germany*, as within the Walls "of *Rome* it self, or the *Vatican*. And yet its other "Constitutions and Decrees are not universally re- "ceived, and it may be never will. Now, Sir, al- "though we allow some Councils have made Decrees "for deposing in particular Cases; yet the Power "it self not being declared as a doctrinal Point, "and the Decrees relating only to Discipline and "Government, it comes short of being an Ar- "ticle of our Faith, and all that in your Answer "depends on it, falls to the ground.

Now in answer to this, I must inquire into these three things. First, Whether nothing be an Article of Faith but what is decreed with an *Anathema*. Secondly, Whether the deposing Decree be a Doctrinal

Doctrinal Point, or only matter of Diſcipline and Government. Thirdly, What Authority General Councils have in *decretis morum*, or ſuch matters as concern Diſcipline and Government.

Firſt, Whether nothing be an *Article of Faith*, but what is decreed with an *Anathema*. Now here we muſt (1) conſider, what they mean by an Article of Faith. For an Article of Faith may be taken in a ſtrict, or in a large Senſe. In a ſtrict Senſe, it ſignifies only ſuch Articles, the belief of which is neceſſary to Salvation; in a large Senſe, it includes all Doctrinal Points, whatever is propoſed to us to be believed: There are Articles of both theſe Kinds, both in Scripture, and in ſome General Councils; and the difference between them is not, that we muſt believe the one, and may refuſe to believe the other, when they are both propoſed with equal Evidence and Authority; but that a miſtake in one is not of ſuch dangerous conſequence, as it is to miſtake the other. Whoever refuſes to believe, whatever is plainly taught in Scripture, and which he believes to be taught there, is an Infidel, and guilty of disbelieving God, though the thing be of no great conſequence in it ſelf, but what he might ſafely have been ignorant of, or miſtaken in; and thus it is with General Councils, if we believe them to be infallible; though their definitions are not all of equal neceſſity, yet they are all equally true: and therefore we muſt not pick and chuſe, what we will believe, and what we will not believe in the Definitions of a General Council; but we muſt believe them all, if not to be equally neceſſary, yet to be equally true; and therefore to reject the belief of any thing plainly taught

in

in the Council as points of Doctrine, is to disown the Authority and Infallibility of the Council. Whatever is defined in the Council is the Faith of the Council, and therefore of the Catholick Church, which is both represented, and infallibly taught by a General Council; and if we will give Men leave to distinguish, they may soon distinguish away all the Council; for it is ease for every Man to find a distinction to excuse him from believing, what he does not like. And I believe this is the true reason of this Dispute about the Marks and Characters of Articles of Faith, that Roman Catholicks must maintain the infallibility of their General Councils, and yet meet with some things in them which either they do not believe or dare not own: and therefore (though it may be they do not believe the Infallibility of Councils themselves, yet) they are put to hard shifts, to find out some Salvo to reconcile the Infallibility of their Councils, with their disowning some of their Decrees. But this will not do; for though Men, who believe these Councils to be infallible, are not bound to believe all their Definitions to be Articles of Faith in such a strict Sense, as to make the belief of them necessary to Salvation, yet they are bound to believe all their Definitions to be true: and therefore we have no need of any other Book of the Roman Catholick Faith, than to examine, what is defined in their Councils, whether with or without an *Anathema*, it is all one; for all Doctrines decreed by the Council must be as infallibly true, as the Council is, and must be owned by all those, who own the Authority of the Council.

Secondly, and therefore the use of *Anathema* is not to confirm Articles of Faith, but to condemn Hereticks,

Hereticks, and does not concern the Faith, but the Diſcipline of the Church. *Anathemas* relate properly to Perſons, not to Doctrines. The Faith of the Church is ſetled by the Definitions of Councils, and muſt be ſo, before there can be any place for *Anathemas*. For till it be determined, what the true Faith is, how can they curſe or condemn Hereticks? The infallible Authority of the Council to declare the Faith, gives Life and Soul to the Decree; the *Anathema* ſignifies only what Cenſure the Church thinks fit to inflict upon Hereticks, who deny this Faith. And therefore even in the Council of *Trent* the Decrees of Faith, and the Anathematizing Canons are two diſtinct things; the firſt explains the *Catholick Verity*, and requires all Chriſtians to believe as they teach, and this eſtabliſhes the Faith before the *Anathemas* are pronounced by their Canons, and whether any *Anathema* had been denounced or no. And thus it is even in the Council of *Trent*, which decrees the Doctrine of Purgatory without an Anathema, and yet aſſerts it to be the Doctrine of the Scriptures, and Fathers and Councils, and commands the Biſhops to take care this Doctrine be preached to all Chriſtian People, and believed by them, which, *Melchior Canus* ſaies, is a ſufficient mark of an Article of Faith without an Anathema; and I ſuppoſe the Reflecter will grant, that the Doctrine of Purgatory is an Article of Faith. The validity of the *Anathema* depends upon the truth and certainty of the Decree or Definition of Faith, not the truth of the Definition upon the *Anathema*; for it is ſtrange, if the Church cannot infallibly declare the Doctrines of Faith without curſing; that the moſt damning Councils ſhould be the moſt infallible; which, if it be true, I confeſs, gives great Authority to the Council of *Trent*.

De auct Conc. l. 5.

I do

I do not deny, but that there is great reaſon for the Church in ſome caſes to denounce *Anathema's* againſt great and notorious Hereticks; but I ſay this belongs to the Diſcipline, not to the Faith of the Church; and it is very unreaſonable to think, that when a Council defines what we are to believe in any particular point, they ſhould not intend to oblige all Chriſtians to believe ſuch definitions, unleſs they curſe thoſe who do not: In the Council of *Florence* they decreed the Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt from Father and Son, the Doctrine of Purgatory, the Primacy and Supremacy of the Biſhop of *Rome*, without an *Anathema*, which I ſuppoſe, the Church of *Rome* owns for Articles of Faith, and the Council intended ſhould be received as ſuch: And in the ſame Council Pope *Eugenius* IV. in his Decree for the Union of the *Armenians*, delivers them the whole Faith of the Church of *Rome*, all their Creeds, ſeven Sacraments, &c. without any *Anathema*; which ſhows that tho *Anathema's* have been anciently uſed, yet this is but a late invention to diſtinguiſh Articles of Faith from ſome inferior Theological Truths by *Anathema's*; for had it been known in the time of the Council of *Florence*, we may ſuppoſe they would have anathematized too, as well as decreed. But this Council ſuppoſing that now the *Greeks* and *Armenians* were united to the Church of *Rome*, the Hereſie and Schiſm at an end, and the Perſons reconciled, there was no need to exerciſe any Church Cenſures, and therefore no uſe for *Anathema's*: For this ſeems to be the true reaſon why the Council of *Trent* was ſo liberal of *Anathema's*, becauſe there were ſo many obſtinate and incorrigible Hereticks at that time.

Concil. To. 13. p. 510. Lubb.

Ib. p. 530.

2. The next Enquiry is, Whether the depoſing Decree be a Doctrinal Point, or only matter of Diſcipline

and Government: For thus the Reflecter ſays, That *the Depoſing Power is not declared as a Doctrinal Point, and the Decrees relate only to Diſcipline and Government*, and therefore *come ſhort of being an Article of Faith.* This I confeſs, I look on as a very childiſh Evaſion. For as they have been lately told, *To decree what ſhall be done, includes a virtual Definition of that Doctrine on which that Decree is founded.* But I will only ask this Reflecter one ſhort Queſtion, Why he rejects this Decree of Depoſing Heretical Princes, or Favourers of Hereticks? Is it becauſe he thinks the Doctrine of Depoſing Heretical Princes, erroneous, or only becauſe he don't like the Practice of it? If the firſt, then it ſeems this is a Doctrinal Decree, as well as a Decree of Diſcipline and Government: If he only condemns the Practice of it, without renouncing the Doctrine; let him ſay ſo, and ſee how Princes will like it. When Papiſts diſpute among themſelves about this Depoſing Decree; thoſe who are for it, vindicate the Popes Power to depoſe Princes; thoſe who are againſt it, deny that the Pope hath any ſuch Power; which ſhows that they think it a Doctrinal Diſpute; for there is no other difference between them, but whether the Pope has, or has not, Power to do it, which is a point of Doctrine: But when they diſpute with us Hereticks, then the Church has not decreed it as a Point of Doctrine, but only of Diſcipline and Government: But let them tell me then, if this Decree do not involve a Doctrinal Error, what is the fault of it?

Vindicat. of Dr. *Sherlock's* Serm. p. 18.

3. But ſuppoſe this Decree muſt be only ranked among the *decreta morum*, which concern the Diſcipline and Government of the Church, Is not the Authority of the Church as ſacred in ſuch matters, as in points of Doctrine? Is not the Church guided by an infalli-

ble

ble Spirit in making such Decrees as concern the whole Christian World, and the propagation and security of the Christian Faith? At least, Is not the Church secured from making wicked and sinful Decrees?

The only Example they have in Scripture, whereon to found the Authority and Infallibility of General Councils, is the Conncil of the Apostles at *Jerusalem*, *Acts* 15. And yet that contains no definition of Faith, but a Decree of Manners, as they call it, that is, a rule whereby they are to guide their Actions, without defining any point of Doctrine, whereon that Decree is founded: *It seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things; that ye abstain from meats offered to Idols, and from Blood, and from things strangled, and from Fornication, from which if you keep your selves, ye shall do well; fare ye well.* They might as well object here, as they do against the deposing Decree, That there is no Point of Doctrine determined in it, but it is only a Decree to direct them what to do; and yet we find the Holy Ghost assisting in such Decrees; for indeed the rules of Discipline and Government, to direct the lives and manners of men, is the only proper subject of Ecclesiastical Authority; and therefore we may most reasonably expect, that God should assist and direct his Church in such matters. The Church has no Authority to make new Articles of Faith; the Gospel was preached by Christ, and what Christ could not perfectly instruct them in, because they were not able to bear it at that time, was supplied by the Holy Spirit, who led the Apostles into all truth; and now we must expect no farther Revelations. And therefore as to matters of Faith, the Authority

of General Councils was no more than the Authority of Witneſſes, to declare what Doctrine they received from Chriſt and his Apoſtles; and therefore their Authority could reach no farther, than we may reaſonably preſume them to be credible Witneſſes, that is, while the Tradition might be ſuppoſed clear and ſtrong, which I doubt, will go no farther than the four firſt General Councils, which are Received by the Church of *England*; but the Authority of the Church in Decrees relating to Diſcipline and Government is perpetual; and therefore in all Later Councils (if there be any Infallibility in the Church) I ſhould more ſecurely rely on ſuch Decrees than on their Definitions of Faith. And therefore *Bellarmin* for the Pope, and *Melchior Canus* for General Councils (the two Authors to whom our Reflecter refers us) declare, that they cannot err in thoſe Decrees which relate to manners, if they concern the whole Church, and are in things neceſſary to Salvation, that is, that they cannot forbid any Vertue, nor Command any thing which is a Sin. So that they who believe the Infallibility of Popes and Councils, muſt acknowledg the Lawfulneſs of depoſing Heretical Princes; for if it were Unlawful to do it, Popes and Councils could never Command it.

Bellarm. de Rom. Pontif. l. 4. c. 5. Canus de Auct. Concil. l. 5.

P. 9. Our Reflecter indeed proves, That *ſuch Decrees and Conſtitutions as concern Diſcipline and Government, are not abſolutely obligatory*, from the Example of the Council of Trent, *whoſe decrees of Doctrine are as much acknowledged here by Catholicks in* England, and Germany, *as within the Walls of* Rome *it ſelf, or the* Vatican; *and yet its other Conſtitutions and Decrees are not Univerſally received, and it may be never will.* But pray can he tell me, for what reaſon this is? Let him ſay, if he dare, that it is for want of Authority or Infallibility

bility in the Council to make Decrees to oblige all the Chriſtian World; and if Chriſtian Princes will not ſubmit to the Decrees of Councils, and the Church dares not compel them to it, does this juſtify ſuch a refuſal? The truth is, ſuch Decrees ought not to take place, nor become Laws in a Chriſtian Nation, without the Conſent and Authority of the Soveraign Prince; and therefore the *Roman* Emperors gave Authority to the Decrees of Councils, and made them Laws; but ſince the Church has pretended to act Independently on the Secular Powers, and to give Laws to them without their conſent; no wonder that Princes, who underſtand their own Authority, and have power to defend it, take what they like, and reject the reſt.

And for the ſame reaſon (as our Reflecter obſerves) the Popes ſuffer *ſo many Poſitive aſſertors of the no-depoſing power to paſs without any cenſure of Hereſy.* Which is no Argument, that they do not believe it an *Article of Faith*, as he ſuggeſts; but only that they want power to do it. Princes will not be depoſed now, nor ſuffer thoſe to be Cenſured, who deny the Depoſing Power; But ſhould the bleſſed *Hildebrand*-times return again, we ſhould quickly ſee, whether the Depoſing Power be an Article of Faith or not. P. 10.

What I have now diſcourſed will abundantly juſtify an argument which I find our Reflecter much grieved at. The Anſwerer in his Introduction (p. 14.) lays two paſſages together, which he thinks will oblige them to own the depoſing power: For in the *Papiſt miſrepreſented* (p. 42.) the Author ſaies, *the orders of the ſupream Paſtor are to be obeyed, whether he be Infallible or not*; and in another place he confeſſes, that *Popes have owned the depoſing Doctrine, and acted according*

according to it; and others are bound to obey their Orders, whether Infallible or not, and conſequently by the Doctrine of their Church, to act when the Popes ſhall require it, according to the depoſing power. To this the Reflecter anſwers, That he only made a compariſon between Civil and Eccleſiaſtical power, *That as in the Civil Government the ſentence of the ſupream Judge or higheſt Tribunal is to be obeyed, tho there be no aſſurance of Infallibility or Divine protection from error or miſtake; ſo is he taught ſhould be done to the orders of the ſupream Paſtor, whether he be Infallible or not.* Pag. 15. 16. Now he ſaies, it is as unjuſt from hence to infer, that all the Orders of the Pope muſt be obeyed, as it would be to ſay that Subjects muſt obey their Princes in every thing they command, whether it be good or bad: And I ackowledge his anſwer to be good, if he will grant the depoſing Decree to command a ſin, which he has never done yet; and when he does it, I would deſire him to conſider how to reconcile himſelf to his two Friends *Bellarmine* and *Canus*, who aſſert that Popes and General Councils can make no ſinful Decrees which ſhall relate to the whole Church.

2*ly*. Let us now conſider what faults the Reflecter finds with the Anſwerers way of proceeding; and they are reduced to Four heads.

1*ſt*. He ſaies, that in ſome points the Anſwerer *owns the Doctrine* (which he has repreſented to be *the Faith of a Roman-Catholick*) *to be the eſtabliſhed belief of the Church* of *England*; *as in part, that of the power of Prieſtly abſolution, confeſſion, of due veneration to the Relicks of Saints, of merit, of ſatisfaction, of the authority of the Church, of General Councils.* Now here our Reflecter returns to his old trade of Miſrepreſenting again;

again; for every one who will believe his own eyes, may ſoon ſatisfie himſelf, that the Anſwerer in theſe Doctrines owns nothing which is peculiar to the Faith of a Papiſt, as diſtinguiſhed from the Common Faith of all Chriſtians. He might as well ſay, that becauſe Proteſtants own that Chriſt is to be worſhipped, therefore they *in part* own the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, that Chriſt is to be worſhipped by Images.

This is the very caſe here. The Anſwerer grants, *that Chriſt gave to the Biſhops and Prieſts of the Catholick-Church, authority to abſolve any truly penitent ſinner from his ſins, and that ſuch abſolution is ratified in heaven.* Therefore *in part* he owns the Popiſh Doctrine of Abſolution, which is a Judicial and Pretorian Authority to forgive ſins; tho we think, that to abſolve as a Miniſter and as a Judge, are two very different things; as different as the Kings granting a Pardon, and the Chancellors ſealing it, which is a publick and authentick declaration of the thing. The Anſwerer owns *the ancient practice of Canonical confeſſion, as part of the diſcipline of the Church for publick offences*; that is, that thoſe who had been guilty of any publick and ſcandalous ſins, were not reconciled to the Church without making as publick a confeſſion, and giving publick Teſtimonies of their ſorrow and repentance; therefore he in part owns the Auricular confeſſion of the Church of *Rome*; there being little difference it ſeems, between confeſſing our ſins to the whole Congregation, and in the ear of a Prieſt. He owns the uſe *of voluntary confeſſion, for the eaſe and ſatisfaction of the perplexed minds of* doubting or *dejected Penitents*; and therefore he in part owns the Sacramental Confeſſion, as neceſſary to the Remiſſion of Sins before God.

Pag. 60.

Pag. 62.

The

P. 40. The Anſwerer allows, *A due Veneration to the Bodies of Saints and Martyrs*, i. e. *a Religious Decency to be obſerved towards them, which lies in avoiding any thing like contempt or diſhonour to them, and uſing all ſuch Teſtimonies of Reſpect and Decency, which becomes the remains of excellent Perſons.* And therefore *in part*, he agrees with the Church of *Rome* in giving Divine Worſhip to Relicks, juſt as much as a decent reſpect is a part of Religious Worſhip.

P. 55. The Anſwerer grants, *The neceſſity of good Works in order to the reward of another Life.* And if he will call this Merit (in which large Senſe the Fathers ſometimes uſe that word) we will not diſpute with him about it; but is this to own the Popiſh Doctrine of Merit? *That the good Works of juſtified Perſons, are truly meritorious of the increaſe of Grace, and Eternal Life.*

P. 67. The Anſwerer *diſtinguiſhes between ſatisfaction to the Church before Abſolution*, (according to the Diſcipline of the Primitive Church, which did not uſe to reconcile publick Penitents, till by a long courſe of Penance and Mortification, they had given ſufficient Teſtimonies of the Sincerity of their Repentance, and had made ſome Satisfaction for that Scandal they had given to the Church) *and Satisfaction to the Juſtice of God, for ſome part of the Puniſhment to Sin, which is unremitted.* The firſt we own, as a very uſeful part of Church Diſcipline, and wiſh the reſtoring of it; but the ſecond, we utterly diſown; for there is no other Satisfaction to the Juſtice of God for Sin, but the meritorious Death and Sacrifice of Chriſt; whereas the Church of *Rome* takes no notice of Satisfaction in the firſt ſence, but has changed the Ancient Diſcipline of Satisfaction to the Church, into Satisfaction to the Juſtice of God for Sin. The

The Anſwerer grants, *That truly penitential Works are pleaſing to God, ſo as to avert his Diſpleaſure, but denies* the Popiſh Doctrine of Satisfaction, *that there can be any Compenſation by way of Equivalency, between what we Suffer, and what we Deſerve*: and is this *in part*, to own his Doctrine of Satisfaction?

The Anſwerer owns *the right and neceſſity of General Councils, (upon great Occaſions) if they be truly ſo; which have been, and may be of great uſe to the Chriſtian World, for ſetling the Faith, healing the Breaches of* Chriſtendom, *and reforming Abuſes; and that the Decrees of ſuch Councils ought to be ſubmitted to, where they proceed upon certain Grounds of Faith, and not upon unwritten Traditions.* But this is no part of the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome* concerning Councils, which owns the Authority of all Councils called by the Pope, and confirmed by him, tho (as we ſay) neither Free nor General; and aſcribes an unerring Infallibility to them, and ſo puts an end to all inquiries into the Grounds of their Faith. We are ſorry we are at ſuch a diſtance from the Church of *Rome*, that there are few things beſides the common Principles of Chriſtianity, wherein we can own any part of their Doctrine; and if we own no more than the Anſwerer has done, I think the Reflecter has no great Reaſon to Glory in it. P. 91.

2*ly*, The Reflecter charges the Anſwerer, with *appealing from the Definitions of their Councils, and ſenſe of their Church, to ſome Expreſſions found in old Maſs-Books, Rituals*, &c. what this *&c.* means, I cannot tell; for I find but one inſtance of this in the whole Anſwer, relating to the Worſhip of the Virgin *Mary*, That famous Hymn, P. 11.

O felix puerpera noſtra pians ſcelera
Jure Matris impera Redemptori!

P. 35. *O happy Mother! who deſt expiate our ſins! by the right of a Mother command our Redeemer*, being found in the old *Paris* Miſſal, which the Anſwerer himſelf has ſeen, and *as* Balinghem *a Jeſuit ſaith, in the Miſſals of* Tournay, Liege, Amiens, Artois, *and the Old*-Roman. Now I confeſs, I ſhould not have thought it ſo great a fault, to have taken the ſence of their Church from their Miſſals, be they never ſo old: for their Miſſals are not like private books of devotion, but are the allowed and approved worſhip of their Church, as our Liturgy is; and therefore is either the ſence of their Church at preſent, or once was ſo; and if it be damnable to own that the Virgin is more powerful than her Son (or can command him, which ſeems to be an argument of greater power) it is very hard to charge it upon an Infallible Church, that her publick Offices did once contain damnable Errors; for ſurely, She was not Infallible then; which may bring her Infallibility into queſtion ſtill. And therefore old Miſſals have ſo much Authority ſtill, that nothing contained in them ought to be thought damnable.

And yet the Anſwerer does not appeal from the Definitions of Councils, to old Maſs-books; for the Church of *Rome* has never condemned this Hymn, nor the Doctrine of it. The Council of *Trent*, in her Decree for Invocation of Saints, ſaith nothing in particular of the Worſhip of the Virgin *Mary*, and yet all *Roman* Catholicks make a vaſt difference between the Worſhip of the *Virgin*, and other Saints; how then ſhall we learn the Senſe of the Church, but from her Practice, from her publick Offices and Hymns? And

tho

tho, ſince Hereticks have been Inquiſitive into theſe matters, they have reformed ſome of their Hymns, yet they have never condemned the old ones. And if he remembers, the Anſwerer in the ſame place told him a notable Story, whereby he might gueſs at the Senſe, at leaſt, of the governing part of their Church ſtill; *That a Book, which was writ by a Gentleman ten Years ſince, to bring the People to a bare* Ora pro nobis, *to the bleſſed Virgin, was ſo far from being approved, that it was condemned at* Rome, *and vehemently oppoſed by the Jeſuits in* France, *and a whole Volume publiſhed againſt it.* P. 36.

3*ly*, He complains, that the Anſwerer *appeals from the Declaration of their Councils, and Senſe of their Church, to ſome External Action, as in caſe of reſpect ſhewn to Images and Saints, upon which, from our External Adoration, by conſtruction of the Fact, viz. Kneeling, Bowing, &c. you are willing to conclude us guilty of Idolatry: As if a true Judgment could be made of theſe Actions, without reſpect to the Intention of the Church, who directs them, and of the Perſon that does them.* The Paragraph in the Anſwer (*p.* 21.) to which the Reflecter refers us, is but a ſhort one, and if he had thought fit to anſwer it, it would have cleared this point. He ſaies, *To Worſhip Stocks or Stones for Gods*, (as far as we charge them with any ſuch thing) ſignifies, *to give to Images made of Wood and Stone, the Worſhip due only to God, and ſo by conſtruction of the Fact, to make them Gods, by giving them Divine Worſhip. And if they will clear themſelves of this, they muſt either prove that External Adoration is no part of Divine Worſhip (notwithſtanding the Scripture makes it ſo, and all the reſt of mankind look upon it as ſuch, even* Jews, Turks *and* Infidels) *or that* P. 11, 12.

their External Adoration hath no reſpect to the Images (which is contrary to the Council of Trent) *or that Divine Worſhip being due to the Being repreſented, it may be likewiſe given to the Image; and how then could the* Gnoſticks *be Condemned for giving Divine Worſhip to the Image of Chriſt, which* Bellarmin *confeſſes, and is affirmed by* Irenæus, Epiphanius, *St.* Auſtin, *and* Damaſcen?

Wherein now does the Anſwerer *appeal from the Declarations of their Councils, and ſenſe of their Church, to External Actions?* Does the Council forbid ſuch External Acts of Adoration, as Kneeling, Bowing, Offering Incenſe, *&c.* to be paid to Images? No it injoyns it. Does the Council then deny, that the Worſhip which is paid before the Image, has regard to the Image? No, both the *Trent* Council and Catechiſm teach the Worſhip of Images. The whole Myſtery of this pretended Appeal from their Church and Councils to External Actions, is no more than this, that they do not believe the giving ſuch Worſhip to Images, to be giving the Worſhip due to God to Images; and the Anſwerer conſidering the Nature of thoſe External Acts of Adoration, knows not how to excuſe them from it, but has put him into a way of doing it, if he can; if he can either prove, that External Adoration is no part of Divine Worſhip, or that they do not give this External Worſhip to Images, or that Divine Worſhip being due to the *Being* Repreſented, it may likewiſe be given to the Image; then he will grant that they are not guilty of Worſhiping Stocks and Stones for Gods; but till he can do this, he muſt give us leave to Interpret ſuch Actions, as all Mankind beſides themſelves Interpret them.

But

But our Reflecter did not like this, he is for Judging of Actions *by the intention of the Church that directs them, and of the Person that does them.* Well, and what is their intention in it? Is it not to Worship Images? Yes, this is the Intention, and the expreſs Declaration of their Church. Right! but their Church does not intend to break the Second Commandment, and to commit Idolatry in the Worſhip of Images, and therefore you ought not to charge this upon them. Very true! nor did ever any man in the World intend to commit Idolatry. We charge them not with any ſuch intention; but if they Worſhip Images, we deſire to know how they excuſe themſelves from breaking the Second Commandment, and committing Idolatry? Whether they are Idolaters or not, let God Judg; but we think we ſhould be guilty of Idolatry if we did it, and that is the reaſon, why we cannot comply with ſuch practiſes.

I would only deſire to know, whether there be any ſuch thing as External and Viſible Idolatry? If there be, it muſt conſiſt in External and Viſible Actions, for we can never know what mens intentions are, but by their Actions; and then if men do ſuch Actions as are Idolatrous, how can the intention excuſe them from Idolatry? Eſpecially no intention can alter the nature of actions, which are determined by a Divine or Human Law; for then men might Murder, or commit Adultery, or Steal, or Forſwear themſelves, and yet avoid the ſin and guilt of ſuch actions, by intending to do no evil in them; if then the External Acts of Kneeling or Bowing to or before an Image, directing ſuch Actions to the Image, be called Worſhiping of them, and are forbid

in

in the Second Commandment, without any regard to what intentions men have in doing so, we put no other Interpretation upon such Actions, but what the Divine Law puts upon them; and if they will venture to Expound them otherwise, and think to Justify themselves in doing forbidden Actions, by their good Intentions; they think they may; but we dare not.

P. 12. As for what he says, that these Actions, such as Bowing, Kneeling, &c. *are in themselves indifferent, and capable of being paid to God and men*; I readily grant it; but is there then no way to distinguish between Civil and Religious Worship, between the Worship of God and men? I will tell him one Infallible Distinction, allowed by all the rest of mankind, *viz.* the Worship of the Invisible Inhabitants of the other World, tho with such External Acts as may be paid to Creatures, has always been accounted Religious Worship. Civil Respects are confined to this World, as all Natural and Civil Relations, which are the Foundation of Civil Respects, are; but we have no Intercourse with the other World, but what is Religious. And therefore as the different kinds and degrees of Civil Honour are distinguished by the sight of the object, to which they are paid, tho the External Acts and Expressions are the same; as when men bow the Body, and are uncovered, you know what kind of Honour it is by seeing who is present, whether their Father, their Friend, or their Prince, or some other Honourable Persons; so the most certain mark of distinction between Civil and Religious VVorship is this, That the one relates to this VVorld, the other to the Invisible Inhabitants of the next.

But

But God allows us to Worſhip no Inviſible Being but himſelf, which would unavoidably confound the Worſhip of God and Creatures. If the Reflecter can give me any one Inſtance of any Nation in the World, which did not account the Worſhip of all Inviſible Beings to be Religious, I will own my ſelf miſtaken. And if all Worſhip of Inviſible Beings is Divine and Religious Worſhip, this puts an end to this Diſpute, and *Abigail* might fall down on her Face before *David*, and the Beggars in *Lincolns-Inn-Fields* may beg upon their Knees (as the Reflecter argues) without any *conſtructive Idolatry*; but ſo cannot a Papiſt, who prays to the Virgin *Mary*, to Saint *Peter*, and Saint *Paul*; now they are in an inviſible State, with all the External Signs of Worſhip and Adoration, excepting Sacrifice, which we can give to God himſelf: And as for his Inſtance of *Joſhua*'s falling down before the Angel, when he can prove that this was only a created Angel, and that *Joſhua* took him for no more, we will conſider it farther.

Now, if to Worſhip any Inviſible Being, be to give Divine Honours to it; then to be ſure, to Worſhip the Image of ſuch an Inviſible Being, muſt be Religious Worſhip alſo. For if the Worſhip of the Image be referred to that Inviſible Being, whom the Image repreſents, it cannot be Civil, but Religious Honour.

4. The laſt Complaint is, That the Anſwerer *appeals from their Councils, and Senſe of their Church, to the ſentiments of ſome private Authors.* And this I confeſs were a juſt Exception againſt the Anſwer, if it were true; but I challenge him to give any one Inſtance of it, wherein the Anſwerer has ſet up the judgment of private Authors againſt the declared Senſe and Judgment

ment of their Councils and Church. He has indeed quoted ſeveral of their Authors, and to very good purpoſe; as to give an account of matter of Fact, and what the practice of their Church is, and what Opinion Wiſe Men among them had of ſuch practices; to which purpoſe he cites ſome *French* Authors, *Wicelius*, and *Vives*, (p. 27, 28.) which our Reflecter is ſo much grieved at; or to give an Hiſtorical Account of the ſtate of the Controverſie, what it was before, and what ſince the Council of *Trent*; as about the worſhip of Images, *p.* 17. about the neceſſity of Confeſſion, *p.* 61. or about the Senſe and Interpretation of ſome controverted Texts of Scripture; or to ſtate the notions of things expreſſed, but not defined by the Council; as what Merit is; (*p.* 57.) for tho the Church has defined the good works of juſtified Perſons to be truly meritorious, yet it has not told us what true and proper Merit is, and therefore we muſt learn this from the allowed and received definitions of their Divines. Thus the Council has determined due Honour and Worſhip to be given to Images, but has not determined what this due Honour and Worſhip is; and therefore we have no way to know it, but by appealing to the general Practice of the Church, and the Doctrine of their Divines; which is not to oppoſe the ſentiments of private Authors to the judgment of the Church, but where the Church has not explained her ſelf, to learn her ſenſe as well as we can, from their moſt approved Divines. Thus the Council has decreed the uſe of Indulgences, but has not defin'd in what caſes and to what purpoſes they may be uſed; and therefore when the Repreſenter ſays confidently, that it is only a relaxation of Canonical Penances, the Authority, and eſpecially the argument of *Greg. de Valent.*

Valent. and *Bellarmin* are good againſt him, tho not againſt their Church, had their Council defined it. (*p.* 66.) When he aſſerts that Indulgences are not ſold, the Tax of the Apoſtolick Chamber is good Authority againſt him; eſpecially, if thoſe who ſell Indulgences receive the Money only under the notion of Alms, which is allowed by the Council; and when he denies, that Indulgences do concern the remiſſion either of mortal or venial ſins, the Anſwerer might well appeal to the very form of the Popes Bulls, which not only grant the remiſſion of ſins, but in ſome caſes the plenary, and moſt plenary remiſſion of ſins.

Thus in what caſes the Pope can diſpenſe, and in what not, is not determined by the Council, and therefore there is no other way of knowing how large this power is, but by appealing to the practice of Popes in granting Diſpenſations, and the Opinions of their *Divines* and *Canoniſts* about it: And I cannot imagine what ſhould make the Reflecter ſo angry with the Anſwerer for ſtating this matter, as he ſeems to be (*p.* 17.) but that he rebukes his confidence by diſcovering his unskilfulneſs in ſuch diſputes: Nor do I diſcern the Anſwerers fault in ſaying, *We know this diſpenſing power is to be kept as a great Myſtery, and not to be made uſe of but upon weighty and urgent cauſes of great conſequence and benefit to the Church, as their Doctrines* (tho the *Errata*, which a Reflecter ought to have conſulted, would have told him it ſhould be *Doctors*) *declare*; for if their Doctors, who may be preſumed beſt to underſtand the intrigue, do ſay this, what fault did the Anſwerer commit in ſaying it after them; and thus it is in ſeveral other caſes; the Anſwerer has alledged the Opinions of their Divines and Caſuiſts, Not to oppoſe them to the Authority of the Church, but to

learn from them what is the moſt received and currant Doctrine in ſuch matters as are not expreſly defined by their Councils; and is this like picking up ſome particular ſayings out of private Authors, to charge them upon any Church? I do not think my ſelf concerned to examine his citations out of ſome of our Authors, there being ſo great a diſparity between theſe two caſes; but if he have dealt by others as he has done by the Anſwerer, he is a very Miſrepreſenter ſtill. He ſays, *The Anſwerer ſeems to maintain, that good works of juſtified perſons are not free.* And the Anſwerer indeed does ſay, that they are not free, as freedom is oppoſed to a Divine aſſiſtance in doing them, and to an antecedent obligation to do them, which freedom is neceſſary to merit; but does this deſtroy the liberty of the Will as aſſiſted by the Divine Grace? Or will the Reflecter own ſuch a freedom as the Anſwerer denies?

Page 17. Theſe are all the material Exceptions the Reflecter has made againſt the Anſwer, which come to little more than ſome popular talk; for I do not think the Viſion of St. *Perpetua* worth diſputing about; and if he did not think this Viſion gave ſome Credit to the Doctrine of Purgatory, I would know why he mentioned it. The Anſwerer does not charge them with making ſuch Viſions and Apparitions, the only Foundation of Purgatory; but certainly thoſe who have taken ſo much pains to tell, if not to invent, ſuch Stories, and to father them upon ancient Writers, did think that they would do ſome ſervice to propagate the belief of it in the World: and if this be true, I know no reaſon they have to be aſhamed of them, and notwithſtanding all their other arguments, I confeſs I think they want them.

And

And now I know nothing in his Reflections unanswered but some Popular Harangues and Insinuations; but plain truth, like a true Beauty, needs no Paint and Varnish; and therefore I shall only for a Conclusion assure our People, That the Answer is every way agreeable to its Title, *the Doctrines and Practises of the Church of* Rome *truly Represented*; and when this Reflecter, or any one for him, shall think fit to examine any part of it as it becomes men, and Scholars, they shall either have a fair Reply, or a Recantation.

FINIS.